

REMARKS

Claims 1- 10 remain pending in this application.

Claims 11-15 are new.

Claim 11 is a method claim analogue of apparatus Claim 1. Further support for this new claim is found in the specification on page 4, line 26 to page 5, line 4, Fig. 2, and in other places.

Claim 12 is a method claim analogue of apparatus Claim 2.

Claim 13 is a method claim analogue of apparatus Claim 3.

Claim 14 is a method claim analogue of apparatus Claim 4.

Claim 15 is a method claim analogue of apparatus Claim 5.

No new matter is added in view of these amendments.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuyama et al. (5,701,385) in view of Abe et al. (5,978,546).

The present claimed invention recites a digital television receiver. The digital television receiver includes a receiving means that has a selectable first and second input. The first input receives a broadcast digital television signal. The second input receives a digital television signal from a reproduction apparatus. Both inputs generate a video signal for display. A device is coupled to the receiving means for generating a display message responsive to display message data derived from the selected input as and combining the display message with the video signal.

The present claimed invention provides a "decoder 117 [that] may be utilized to decode transport streams from external packet sources [as well as decode internal packet sources] thereby reducing the cost of [the] other

sources" (page 3, lines 17-18). The "inventive interconnection arrangement [provides] a demodulated transport bit stream...coupled from receiver IRD 100 to recorder 200 via a bi-directional data bus 112" (page 4, lines 26-28). Therefore, a video signal can be generated in a single receiver, from multiple digital inputs using one decoder.

Katsuyama et al. teach an apparatus for replaying a disc-shaped recording medium. A replay unit conducts the replay processing of data read out from the head. A display data producing unit produces a plurality of display data for conducting a plurality of display indicating the contents recorded on the respective disc-shaped recording media which have been received in the receiver within one screen.

The Examiner contends that Katsuyama et al. teach a reproducing apparatus including receiving means for receiving a digital signal reproduced from the reproducing apparatus. Though Katsuyama et al. teach a receiving means for receiving a digital signal reproduced from the reproducing apparatus Katsuyama et al. neither disclose nor suggest "a receiving means having a selectable first and second input, said first input receiving a broadcast digital television signal and said second input receiving a digital television signal from a reproduction apparatus" as claimed in claim 1 of the present invention. In fact Katsuyama et al. are not concerned with switching between multiple digital inputs using a single decoder but only switching between a digital and analog input.

The system of Abe et al. provides automatic discrimination between an analog mode and a digital mode. Therefore, erroneous operations, such as an erroneous erasing operation can be prevented.

The Examiner contends that incorporating a receiver capable of selecting between the reproduced digital signal and the broadcast digital signal is well known in the art as taught by Abe et al. The system of Abe et al.

switches between a digital and analog VTR mode and not between multiple digital inputs using a single decoder as in the present claimed invention. "In an analog VTR mode,...the audio signal is transferred...through the FM audio signal processor 53 [and] the switching circuit 51" (Col 5, lines 15-21). In a digital VTR mode, a digital signal applied to the terminal 22 is sent through the digital signal processor 54 [and] the switching circuit 51" (Col 5, lines 36-38). Though Abe et al. teaches a system able to switch between an analog and a digital VTR mode, Abe et al. neither disclose nor suggest "a receiving means having a selectable first and second input, said first input receiving a broadcast digital television signal and said second input receiving a digital television signal from a reproduction apparatus" as claimed in claim 1 of the present invention.

The Examiner opines that the combination of the systems of Katsuyama et al. and Abe et al. would form a system which would make the present claimed invention, as described in claim 1, unpatentable. The applicant contends that there is no motivation or reason to combine the systems of Katsuyama et al. and Abe et al. Katsuyama et al. and Abe et al. are concerned with solving two different problems. Katsuyama et al. seek to provide an apparatus for replaying recorded mediums with audio/video data as well as extra data messages within. Abe et al. seek to provide a video tape recorder able to change settings for different analog and digital media.

However, even if one were to combine the two systems, the combination would produce an apparatus replaying analog and digital recorded mediums with audio/video data as well as extra data messages within. The combination would not switch between multiple digital inputs using a single decoder as in the present claimed invention. Therefore, similarly to the individual systems, the combination of the systems of Katsuyama et al. and Abe et al. both neither disclose nor suggest "a receiving means having a selectable first and second input, said first input receiving a broadcast digital television signal and said

second input receiving a digital television signal from a reproduction apparatus” as claimed in claim 1 of the present invention.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Katsuyama et al. adds nothing when taken alone or in combination with Abe et al. that would make the present claimed invention unpatentable. Since claim 2 is dependant on independent claim 1 it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Katsuyama et al. in view of Abe et al. showing the above discussed features. It is thus further respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 2 are not anticipated by Katsuyama et al. in view of Abe et al. It is thus, further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 3-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuyama et al. (5,701,385) in view of Abe et al. (5,978,546) and Levine (5,915,068).

The present invention, as claimed in claim 6, provides a receiving device coupled to a reproduction apparatus for receiving and decoding digital signals. The device includes means for receiving a digital video signal as well as a first and second control signal from the reproduction apparatus. A decoder is coupled to the receiving means for decoding the digital video signal and generating a video display signal. An on screen display message generator is coupled to the decoder for generating a display message and combining the display message with the video display signal. A memory contains message

data for an on screen display. The message data represents display messages for the receiving device and the reproduction apparatus. A controller receives the first and second control signals and is coupled to the generating means and the memory for selecting message data. In response to the first signal the controller selects a specific message stored for the reproduction apparatus. When the message data in the memory is absent, the controller couples the second control signal to the generating means to generate a message.

Claim 6 contains similar limitations to claim 1. Just as the system of claim 1 allows switching between multiple digital inputs using a single decoder, claim 6 provides a receiving device coupled to a reproduction apparatus receiving digital signals to be decoded. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that the arguments made above regarding the patents to Katsuyama et al. and Abe et al. concerning claim 1 also apply to claim 6.

Levine teaches a system for programming the automatic operation of a video recorder over an extended period using an associated television receiver as a display device for alphanumeric messages to the operator to provide a self-explanatory, interactive programming routine.

The Examiner contends that Levine teaches an apparatus having a memory for storing a message to be superimposed on a video signal. Even though the system of Levine teaches an apparatus having a memory for storing a message to be superimposed on a video signal, Levine neither discloses nor suggests "a receiving device coupled to a reproduction apparatus for receiving and decoding digital signals" as claimed in claim 6 of the present invention.

The Examiner opines that the combination of the systems of Katsuyama et al., Abe et al. and Levine would form a system which would make the present claimed invention, as described in claim 6, unpatentable. The applicant contends that there is no motivation or reason to combine the systems of Katsuyama et al., Abe et al. and Levine. Katsuyama et al., Abe et al. and

Levine are concerned with solving different problems. Katsuyama et al. seek to provide an apparatus for replaying recorded mediums with audio/video data as well as extra data messages within. Abe et al. are concerned with discriminating between analog and digital modes. Levine seeks to provide a system for programming the automatic operation of a video recorder over an extended time period. None of these references are concerned with switching between multiple digital inputs using a single decoder as in the present invention.

However, even if one were to combine the three systems, the result would be an apparatus replaying digital or analog recorded mediums with audio/video data as well as extra data messages stored in memory. The combination would not switch between multiple digital inputs using a single decoder as in the present claimed invention. Therefore, similarly to the individual systems, the combination of the systems of Katsuyama et al., Abe et al. and Levine neither disclose nor suggest "a receiving device coupled to a reproduction apparatus for receiving and decoding digital signals" as claimed in claim 6 of the present invention.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Katsuyama et al. adds nothing when taken alone or in combination with Abe et al. and Levine that would make the present claimed invention unpatentable. Since claims 7-10 are dependant on independent claim 6 it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 6.

Furthermore, the Examiner opines that the combination of the systems of Katsuyama et al., Abe et al. and Levine would make the present claimed invention, as described in Claims 3-5, unpatentable. The applicant respectfully submits that, as discussed above, Katsuyama et al., Abe et al. and Levine neither disclose nor suggest "a receiving means having a selectable first and second input, said first input receiving a broadcast digital television signal and

said second input receiving a digital television signal from a reproduction apparatus" as claimed in claim 1 of the present invention. As claims 3-5 are dependant on claim 1 it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-5 are patentable for the same reasons as described above in regards to claim 1. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in any of Katsuyama et al., Abe et al. and Levine when taken alone or in any combination showing the above discussed features. It is thus further respectfully submitted that claims 3-10 are not anticipated by Katsuyama et al., Abe et al. and Levine. It is thus, even further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

The applicant respectfully submits, in view of the above arguments, that the all arguments made by the Examiner have been addressed and this rejection should be withdrawn. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that the present claimed invention is patentable.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Harold Blatter

By: 

Joel Fogelson
Reg. No. 43,613
Tel. No. (609) 734-6809

Thomson Licensing Inc.
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
January 11, 2005